
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION

Diane R. Prigge, v. Woods Cross Police Department, et al.,	Plaintiff, Defendants.	MEMORANDUM DECISION AND ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR CONSULTATION Case No. 2:16-cv-00140-JNP-BCW District Judge Jill Parrish Magistrate Judge Brooke Wells
--	-------------------------------	--

This case is referred to the undersigned from Judge Parrish in accordance with [28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)\(B\)](#).¹ Plaintiff, Ms. Prigge, filed a Complaint against the Woods Cross Police Department and other Defendants on March 28, 2016.² Plaintiff alleges she was handing out copies of her resume to local businesses around the area when she was “abducted from the Hampton Inn.”³ According to Ms. Prigge, certain Woods Cross police officers showed up at her door and arrested her without a warrant.⁴ Ms. Prigge then had to leave behind certain belongings when she left with the police. Ms. Prigge “was not booked, nor finger printed but given food inside a jail cell for two days.”⁵ Plaintiff alleges she never received her cell phone back after it went missing.⁶ Plaintiff also makes allegations against a court in New Jersey and Judge Andrea Carter who failed to correctly record Ms. Prigge’s daughter’s date of birth.⁷

¹ Docket no. 5.

² Docket no. 4.

³ Complaint p. 2.

⁴ *Id.* p. 2-4.

⁵ *Id.* p. 4.


⁶ *Id.* p. 5.

⁷ *Id.* p. 6.

Plaintiff has filed a document that states she “requests in this motion for consultation as this matter is more complex than meet the eye.”⁸ The court construes this document as a Motion for Consultation.⁹ In her motion Ms. Prigge goes on to relate her experience in graduating with a degree in paralegal earned in Arizona. She also states that other cases filed by her in Arizona and in New Jersey “have never been heard . . .”¹⁰ The court has carefully considered Ms. Prigge’s motion. It is unclear from the motion, however, what relief she is requesting. In a broad sense it appears she is requesting consultation, but it is unknown with whom she desires a consultation or exactly why such a consultation is necessary. A broad unsupported assertion that the case is “more complex than meets the eye” does not justify a consultation even if it was known with whom Ms. Prigge desires such a consultation.

Accordingly, the court DENIES Ms. Prigge’s Motion for Consultation.

DATED this 13 May 2016.



Brooke C. Wells
United States Magistrate Judge

⁸ Mtn. p. 1, docket no. 12.

⁹ Docket no. 12.

¹⁰ *Id.*